

Coplanarity of lines in spine spaces

K. Petelczyc and M. Żynel

December 6, 2016

Abstract

A spine space can be considered as fragment of a projective Grassmann space. We prove that the structure of lines together with binary coplanarity relation is a sufficient system of primitive notions for such a geometry.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 51A45, 51A15.

Keywords: Grassmann space, projective space, spine space, coplanarity

Introduction

Following the ideas, motivations, and objectives of [7], where we prove that the structure of lines with binary coplanarity relation is a sufficient system of primitive notions for Grassmann spaces and polar Grassmann spaces, we use similar methods to prove the same for spine spaces. As previously, the key role play cliques of coplanarity which are contained in strong subspaces. The structure of strong subspaces in spine spaces is much more complex but pretty well known if we take a look into [10], [9], [11], and [12]. The major difference is that we have to deal with three types of lines here as strong subspaces can be projective, semi-affine or affine spaces.

1 Generalities

A point-line structure $\mathfrak{A} = \langle S, \mathcal{L} \rangle$, where the elements of S are called *points*, the elements of $\mathcal{L}$ are called *lines*, and where $\mathcal{L} \subset 2^S$, is said to be a *partial linear space*, or a *point-line space*, if two distinct lines share at most one point and every line is of size (cardinality) at least 2 (cf. [2]).

A *subspace* of $\mathfrak{A}$ is any set $X \subseteq S$ with the property that every line which shares with X two or more points is entirely contained in X . We say that a subspace X of $\mathfrak{A}$ is *strong* if any two points in X are collinear. If S is strong then $\mathfrak{A}$ is said to be a *linear space*. A *plane* in $\mathfrak{A}$ is a strong subspace E of $\mathfrak{A}$ with the property that the restriction of $\mathfrak{A}$ to E is a projective or semi-affine plane. For lines $L_1, L_2 \in \mathcal{L}$ we say that they are *coplanar* and write

$$(1) \quad L_1 \pi L_2 \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{there is a plane } E \text{ such that } L_1, L_2 \subset E.$$

For a subspace X of $\mathfrak{A}$ we write

$$(2) \quad L(X) = \{L \in \mathcal{L} : L \subset X\}.$$

Let us fix a subset $\mathcal{H} \subset S$. Consider the structure

$$\mathfrak{M} := \langle S_{\mathcal{H}}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}} \rangle,$$

where

$$S_{\mathcal{H}} := S \setminus \mathcal{H} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}} := \{k \cap S_{\mathcal{H}} : k \in \mathcal{L} \text{ and } |k \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}| \geq 2\},$$

which is a fragment of $\mathfrak{A}$. Note that $\mathfrak{M}$ is a partial linear space. The incidence relation in $\mathfrak{M}$ is again $\in$, inherited from $\mathfrak{A}$, but limited to the new point set and line set. Following a standard convention we call the points and lines of $\mathfrak{M}$ *proper*, and those points and lines of $\mathfrak{M}$ that are not in $S_{\mathcal{H}}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$ respectively are said to be *improper*. The set $\mathcal{H}$ will be called the *horizon* of $\mathfrak{M}$. If U is a proper or improper point in a subspace X of $\mathfrak{M}$, then we write

$$(3) \quad L_U(X) = \{L \in \mathcal{L} : U \in \overline{L} \text{ and } L \subseteq X\}.$$

If E is a plane in $\mathfrak{M}$, then $L(E)$ is a π -clique. We call such cliques *flats*. If X is a strong subspace of $\mathfrak{M}$ and U is a point in X , then $L_U(X)$ is a different kind of a π -clique which we call a *semibundle*.

1.1 Grassmann spaces

Let V be a vector space of dimension n with $3 \leq n < \infty$. The set of all subspaces of V will be written as $\text{Sub}(V)$ and the set of all k -dimensional subspaces (or k -subspaces in short) as $\text{Sub}_k(V)$. By a *k-pencil* we call the set of the form

$$\mathbf{p}(H, B) := \{U \in \text{Sub}_k(V) : H \subset U \subset B\},$$

where $H \in \text{Sub}_{k-1}(V)$, $B \in \text{Sub}_{k+1}(V)$, and $H \subset B$. The family of all such k -pencils will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}_k(V)$. A *Grassmann space* (also known as a *space of pencils* or a *projective Grassmannian*) is a point-line space

$$\mathfrak{M} = \mathbf{P}_k(V) = \langle \text{Sub}_k(V), \mathcal{P}_k(V) \rangle,$$

with k -subspaces of V as points and k -pencils as lines (see [6], [13] for a more general definition, see also [5]). For $0 < k < n$ it is a partial linear space. For $k = 1$ and $k = n - 1$ it is a projective space. So we assume that

$$1 < k < n - 1.$$

It is known that there are two classes of maximal strong subspaces in $\mathfrak{M}$: *stars* of the form

$$S(H) = [H]_k = \{U \in \text{Sub}_k(V) : H \subset U\},$$

where $H \in \text{Sub}_{k-1}(V)$, and *tops* of the form

$$T(B) = (B)_k = \{U \in \text{Sub}_k(V) : U \subset B\},$$

where $B \in \text{Sub}_{k+1}(V)$. Although non-maximal stars $[H, Y]_k$ and non-maximal tops $[Z, B]_k$, for some $Y, Z \in \text{Sub}(V)$, make sense but in this paper when we say ‘a star’ or ‘a top’ we mean a maximal strong subspace. It is trivial that every line, a k -pencil $p = \mathbf{p}(H, B)$, of $\mathfrak{M}$ can be uniquely extended to the star $S(p) := S(H)$ and to the top $T(p) := T(B)$.

1.2 Spine spaces

A *spine space* is a fragment of a Grassmann space chosen so that it consists of subspaces of V which meet a fixed subspace in a specified way. The concept of spine spaces was introduced in [8] and developed in [9], [10], [12], [11].

Let W be a fixed subspace of V and let m be an integer with

$$(4) \quad k - \text{codim}(W) \leq m \leq k, \dim(W).$$

From the points of the Grassmann space $\mathbf{P}_k(V)$ we take those which as subspaces of V meet W in dimension m , that is:

$$\mathcal{F}_{k,m}(W) := \{U \in \text{Sub}_k(V) : \dim(U \cap W) = m\}.$$

As new lines we take those lines of $\mathbf{P}_k(V)$ which have at least two new points:

$$\mathcal{G}_{k,m}(W) := \{L \cap \mathcal{F}_{k,m}(W) : L \in \mathcal{P}_k(V) \text{ and } |L \cap \mathcal{F}_{k,m}(W)| \geq 2\}.$$

The point-line structure:

$$\mathfrak{M} = \mathbf{A}_{k,m}(V, W) := \langle \mathcal{F}_{k,m}(W), \mathcal{G}_{k,m}(W) \rangle$$

will be called a *spine space*. This is a Gamma space. Specifically, depending on k, m and $\dim(W)$ it can be: a projective space, a slit space (cf. [3], [4]), an affine space or the *space of linear complements* (cf. [1], [12]). As $\mathfrak{M}$ is a fragment of the Grassmann space $\mathbf{P}_k(V)$ we can distinguish a set $\mathcal{H}$ of improper points in $\mathfrak{M}$, i.e. a horizon. A line L of $\mathbf{P}_k(V)$ either, is entirely contained in $\mathcal{H}$, meets $\mathcal{H}$ in all except one points, meets $\mathcal{H}$ in precisely one point, or is disjoint to $\mathcal{H}$. Only in the last two cases new lines arise: they will be called *affine* and *projective*, respectively. Note that for affine lines we can define parallelism in a natural way: those lines are parallel which meet in $\mathcal{H}$. The class of affine lines is denoted by $\mathcal{A}$ and projective lines fall into two disjoint classes $\mathcal{L}^\alpha$ and $\mathcal{L}^\omega$. For details see Table 1.

class	representative line $g = \mathbf{P}(H, B) \cap \mathcal{F}_{k,m}(W)$	g^∞
$\mathcal{A}_{k,m}(W)$	$H \in \mathcal{F}_{k-1,m}(W), B \in \mathcal{F}_{k+1,m+1}(W)$	$H + (B \cap W)$
$\mathcal{L}_{k,m}^\alpha(W)$	$H \in \mathcal{F}_{k-1,m}(W), B \in \mathcal{F}_{k+1,m}(W)$	–
$\mathcal{L}_{k,m}^\omega(W)$	$H \in \mathcal{F}_{k-1,m-1}(W), B \in \mathcal{F}_{k+1,m+1}(W)$	–

Table 1: The classification of lines in a spine space $\mathbf{A}_{k,m}(V, W)$.

The geometry of a spine space is complex in that there is an overwhelming variety of types of subspaces. As usual most important are strong subspaces. A star from $\mathbf{P}_k(V)$ restricted to $\mathfrak{M}$ either contains affine lines or not. In the first case it is called an α -star which is a semiaffine space, in the other case it is called an ω -star which is a projective space. A top from $\mathbf{P}_k(V)$ restricted to $\mathfrak{M}$ also contains affine lines or not and is called an ω -top or an α -top respectively. On the other hand, each strong subspace X of a spine space is a slit space, that is a projective

space $\mathbf{P}$ with a subspace $\mathcal{D}$ removed. The form of a maximal strong subspace from each class and the dimension of the corresponding spaces $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are presented in Table 2. In the extremes $\mathcal{D}$ can be void, then X is basically a projective space, or a hyperplane, then X is an affine space.

class	representative subspace	$\dim(\mathbf{P})$	$\dim(\mathcal{D})$
ω -stars	$[H, H + W]_k: H \in \mathcal{F}_{k-1, m-1}(W)$	$\dim(W) - m$	-1
α -stars	$[H, V]_k \cap \mathcal{F}_{k, m}(W): H \in \mathcal{F}_{k-1, m}(W)$	$\dim(V) - k$	$\dim(W) - m - 1$
α -tops	$[B \cap W, B]_k: B \in \mathcal{F}_{k+1, m}(W)$	$k - m$	-1
ω -tops	$[\Theta, B]_k \cap \mathcal{F}_{k, m}(W): B \in \mathcal{F}_{k+1, m+1}(W)$	k	$k - m - 1$

Table 2: The classification of stars and tops in a spine space $\mathbf{A}_{k, m}(V, W)$.

A line of $\mathfrak{M}$ can be in at most two maximal strong subspaces of different type: a star and a top.

FACT 1.1. *A projective star and a projective top are either disjoint or they share a point. In remaining cases, a star and a top are either disjoint or they share a line. Two stars (or two tops) are either disjoint or they share a point.*

LEMMA 1.2. *Three pairwise coplanar and concurrent, or parallel, lines not all on a plane span a star or a top.*

PROOF. There are three planes and it suffices to note by 1.1 that no two of them can be of distinct type, i.e. they all are of type star or top. Consequently, all these lines lie in one maximal strong subspace. $\square$

2 The main theorem

Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be a spine space. The goal now is to show that the set of lines equipped with coplanarity relation π is a sufficient system of primitive notions for $\mathfrak{M}$.

As it was mentioned before, we can speak about the horizon in case of spine spaces. From this point of view a vertex U of a semibundle $L_U(X)$ can be either proper or improper. Thus the name *proper* and *improper semibundle*. We omit the adjective when we mean a semibundle in general.

LEMMA 2.1. *Every maximal π -clique is either a flat or a semibundle.*

PROOF. Let K be a maximal π -clique which is not a flat. So, there are three pairwise distinct lines in K not all on a plane. They all meet in a point U , possibly improper. Moreover, for any $L \in K$ we have $U \in L$.

Let U_1, U_2 be distinct points in $\bigcup K$. There are lines $M_1, M_2 \in K$ such that $U_1 \in M_1, U_2 \in M_2$. As $M_1 \pi M_2$ the points U_1, U_2 are collinear. This means that $\bigcup K$ is a collinearity clique.

Now, let $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ be the Grassmann space embracing $\mathfrak{M}$, and let $\overline{X}$ be a maximal collinearity clique in $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ containing $\bigcup K$. Set $X := \overline{X} \cap \mathcal{F}_{k, m}(W)$. It is clear

that $\bigcup K \subseteq X$. As $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ is a Gamma space $\overline{X}$ is a maximal strong subspace of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$. Therefore, X is a maximal strong subspace of $\mathfrak{M}$. Note that $U \in \overline{X}$. Take a point $W \in X$ distinct from U . There is a, possibly affine, line $M = \overline{U, W}$ contained in $\overline{X}$. Since $\overline{X}$ is, up to an isomorphism, a projective space, all the lines through U in $\overline{X}$ are pairwise coplanar, so $M \in K$. Hence $W \in \bigcup K$ and consequently $\bigcup K = X$. We have actually shown that $K = L_U(X)$ which means that K is a semibundle. $\square$

The reasoning in 2.1 is universal in that it remains valid for general Grassmann spaces discussed in [7] and for polar spine spaces discussed later in this paper. It is worth to point out here that Lemma 1.3 in [7] states the same as 2.1 for general Grassmann spaces but its proof fails to be complete.

As indispensable as the property of the family of maximal π -cliques provided by 2.1 is the characterization of this family in terms of lines and coplanarity, that is an elementary definition of maximal π -cliques within $\langle \mathcal{L}, \pi \rangle$.

We can assume that all stars as projective spaces have dimension d and all tops have dimension d' . Without loss of generality we can assume that $d' \leq d$. For lines $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_d \in \mathcal{L}$ we define

$$(5) \quad \Delta\pi(L_1, L_2, \dots, L_d) \text{ iff } \neq (L_1, L_2, \dots, L_d) \text{ and } L_i \pi L_j \text{ for all } i, j = 1, \dots, d, \\ \text{and for all } M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{L} \text{ if } M_1, M_2 \pi L_1, L_2, \dots, L_d \text{ then } M_1 \pi M_2.$$

Note that for $d = 2$ the relation $\Delta\pi$ is empty, while for $d \geq 3$ it says that the lines $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_d$ form a π -clique, they are not in a pencil, and they could not be contained in the intersection of two π -cliques.

In Grassmann spaces and spine spaces, two distinct π -cliques share at most one line. This is because two strong subspaces share at most a line. It is different in polar Grassmann spaces, where two star semibundles can have a lot more in common (cf. [7]). Note that in Grassmann spaces and spine spaces 3 lines are enough in (5). In case of polar Grassmann spaces however d lines are required. To explain this let us take t lines $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_t$, which are pairwise coplanar, but not all lie on a plane. Assume that these lines are contained in a star S of dimension d and $t < d$. Then, in considered polar geometries there is another star $S' \neq S$ which contains all the lines $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_t$. We can find two lines M_1, M_2 such that $M_1 \subseteq S$, $M_2 \subseteq S'$, $M_1, M_2 \not\subseteq S \cap S'$, and $M_1, M_2 \pi L_1, L_2, \dots, L_t$ but $M_1 \not\pi M_2$. It means that $\Delta\pi$ fails to be true for $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_t$.

The π -clique spanned by the lines $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_d$ is then the set

$$(6) \quad [L_1, L_2, \dots, L_d]_\pi := \{L \in \mathcal{L} : L \pi L_1, L_2, \dots, L_d\}.$$

This lets us tell what the elements of the family $\mathcal{K}$ are in the language of lines and coplanarity relation, namely

$$(7) \quad \mathcal{K} = \{[L_1, L_2, \dots, L_d]_\pi : L_1, L_2, \dots, L_d \in \mathcal{L} \text{ and } \Delta\pi(L_1, L_2, \dots, L_d)\}.$$

LEMMA 2.2. *The family $\mathcal{K}$ of maximal π -cliques is definable in $\langle \mathcal{L}, \pi \rangle$.*

In view of 2.1 the set $\mathcal{K}$ consists of two families: semibundles and flats. By 1.1 the intersection of a flat with a semibundle in a spine space is the empty set, a line, or a pencil of lines. Two distinct maximal π -cliques of the same type are disjoint or share a line. Hence we get the following

LEMMA 2.3. *Elements of the set*

$$(8) \quad \mathcal{P} = \{K_1 \cap K_2 : K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}, K_1 \neq K_2, |K_1 \cap K_2| \geq 2\}.$$

are pencils of lines extendable to semibundles, which are maximal π -cliques.

Two pencils $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ are *coplanar* iff every two lines $l_1 \in p_1, l_2 \in p_2$ are coplanar. That is: let $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}$

$$(9) \quad p_1 \pi p_2 \iff \text{for all } l_1 \in p_1, l_2 \in p_2 \text{ we have } l_1 \pi l_2.$$

A pencil $p_1 \in \mathcal{P}$ is called *improper* if there is $p_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $p_1 \pi p_2$ and $p_1 \cap p_2 = \emptyset$. In other words a pencil is improper iff its vertex is an improper point and it lies on an affine plane.

Loosely speaking, a plane is affine if it contains two disjoint pencils. A pencil $p \in \mathcal{P}$ lies on an affine plane iff there are two distinct pencils $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $p_1 \pi p, p_2 \pi p$ and $p_1 \cap p_2 = \emptyset$. We say that a line l lies on an affine plane iff there is a pencil $p \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $l \in p$ and p lies on an affine plane. If a pencil $p \in \mathcal{P}$ does not lie on an affine plane and every $l \in p$ lies on an affine plane, then we call p a *punctured* pencil. A pencil is punctured iff its vertex is an improper point and it lies on a punctured plane.

A maximal π -clique is *proper* if it contains no improper or punctured pencil. Let us recall that our goal is to reconstruct the point universe of a spine space given a line universe equipped with coplanarity relation. The idea is to use vertices of semibundles to do that. This means that only proper π -cliques are of our concern.

Note that a proper maximal π -clique together with pencils of lines it contains carries the structure of a projective space. The geometrical dimension of a proper flat is always 2 whereas a proper semibundle $L_U(X)$ has dimension one less than the dimension of X . This lets us distinguish proper flats from proper semibundles if we assume that

$$(10) \quad \text{stars or tops in } \mathfrak{M} \text{ are at least 4 dimensional projective or semi-affine spaces}$$

that is, in view of (4) and Table 2, respectively

$$(11) \quad 4 \leq n - k \quad \text{or} \quad 4 \leq k - m.$$

By 2.3 for a proper π -clique K from the set

$$(12) \quad \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{P}} := \{K \in \mathcal{K} : \text{there is } q \in \mathcal{P} \text{ such that } q \subset K\}$$

we can define its geometrical dimension $\dim(K)$. This lets us make the following definition

$$(13) \quad \mathcal{B} := \{K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{P}} : K \text{ is proper and } \dim(K) \geq 3\}.$$

In view of (10)

LEMMA 2.4. *The family $\mathcal{B}$ defined in $\langle \mathcal{L}, \pi \rangle$ coincides with the family of all proper top semibundles, the family of all proper star semibundles or the union of these two families depending on whether tops, stars or all of them are at least 4 dimensional projective or semi-affine spaces.*

On the family $\mathcal{B}$ of proper semibundles we define

$$(14) \quad \Upsilon(K_1, K_2) \iff (\exists L_1, L_2 \in K_1)(\exists M_1, M_2 \in K_2) \\ [L_1 \neq L_2 \wedge L_1 \pi M_1 \wedge L_2 \pi M_2].$$

LEMMA 2.5. *Let $K_i := L_{U_i}(X_i) \in \mathcal{B}$, $i = 1, 2$. If $\Upsilon(K_1, K_2)$ and $K_1 \cap K_2 = \emptyset$, then X_1, X_2 are both stars or tops and $U_1 = U_2$.*

PROOF. By (14) there are lines $L_1 \in K_1$ and $M_1 \in K_2$, which are coplanar. Note that $X_1 \neq X_2$ and $L_1 \neq M_1$ as we assume that $K_1 \cap K_2 = \emptyset$. Let E_1 be a plane containing L_1, M_1 . Then $L_1 \subseteq X_1, E_1$ and $M_1 \subseteq X_2, E_1$. In view of 1.1 it means that X_1, X_2 are both of the same type and E_1 is of different type.

There is another pair of coplanar lines L_2, M_2 such that $L_2 \in K_1$ and $M_2 \in K_2$, since $\Upsilon(K_1, K_2)$. Let E_2 be the plane spanned by L_2, M_2 . Note that E_1, E_2 are planes of the same type. As $U_1, U_2 \in E_1, E_2$, by 1.1 we get that $E_1 = E_2$ or $U_1 = U_2$. If $E_1 = E_2$, then $L_1, L_2, M_1, M_2 \subseteq X_1, X_2$ which yields a contradiction as X_1, X_2 are of the same type. $\square$

The inverse of 2.5 is not true in general. Let X_1 be a semi-affine, but not affine, star. Then X_1 is an α -star (cf. [8], [9], [10]). Take a projective line $L \in K_1$. The line L is an α -line and the unique top-extension of L is an α -top Y , that is a projective space. In case X_2 is an ω -star, that is also a projective space, there is no line in $Y \cap X_2$, provided by 1.1. Therefore we cannot find a line in X_2 , which is coplanar with L . However, two affine lines in K_1 are enough to fix this problem. So, it means that X_1 cannot be a punctured projective space as in such there is only one affine line through a given proper point.

In view of Table 2 punctured projective spaces arise in a spine space as stars when $\dim(W) - m - 1 = 0$ or as tops when $k - m - 1 = 0$. Note that either, all or none of the stars, and respectively, all or none of the tops, are punctured projective spaces. For this reason we assume that

$$(15) \quad \text{no star or no top is a punctured projective space}$$

which in view of Table 2 reads as follows

$$(16) \quad \dim(W) \neq m + 1 \quad \text{or} \quad k \neq m + 1.$$

LEMMA 2.6. *Let $K_i := L_{U_i}(X_i) \in \mathcal{B}$, $i = 1, 2$. If X_1, X_2 are both stars or tops and $U_1 = U_2$, then $\Upsilon(K_1, K_2)$ and $K_1 \cap K_2 = \emptyset$.*

PROOF. By 1.1 we get $K_1 \cap K_2 = \emptyset$. Without loss of generality assume that X_1, X_2 are stars. If X_1 is a projective space (i.e. it is an ω -star), then we take two distinct projective ω -lines $L_1, L_2 \in X_1$. Each of L_1, L_2 can be extended to the semi-affine

ω -top Y_1, Y_2 , respectively. We have $U_1 \in Y_i \cap X_2$ for $i = 1, 2$, so X_2 and Y_i share a line M_i . Moreover $U_1 \in L_i, M_i$, hence $L_i \pi M_i$, and consequently $\Upsilon(K_1, K_2)$.

Assume that X_1 is a semi-affine space (i.e. it is an α -star). There are two distinct affine lines $L_1, L_2 \in K_1$ as X_1 is not a punctured projective space. As in the first case we extend L_1, L_2 to the semi-affine tops and we get our claim. $\square$

We need an equivalence relation to form the bundle of all lines through a given point. For proper semibundles $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ we write

$$(17) \quad \Upsilon_\emptyset(K_1, K_2) \quad \text{iff} \quad \Upsilon(K_1, K_2), \Upsilon(K_2, K_1), \text{ and either } K_1 \cap K_2 = \emptyset \text{ or } K_1 = K_2.$$

To give an idea what $\Upsilon_\emptyset$ stands for let us summarize 2.5 and 2.6.

LEMMA 2.7. *Let $K_i := L_{U_i}(X_i) \in \mathcal{B}$. Then $\Upsilon_\emptyset(K_1, K_2)$ iff X_1, X_2 are both stars or tops and $U_1 = U_2$.*

For a proper semibundle $K \in \mathcal{B}$ we write

$$(18) \quad \Lambda_{\Upsilon_\emptyset}(K) := \bigcup \{K' \in \mathcal{B} : \Upsilon_\emptyset(K, K')\}.$$

We will show that it is the bundle of all lines through the point determined by the semibundle K . Thanks to (10) and (15) all stars or all tops, no matter if they are α or ω , are at least 4 dimensional and are not punctured. This is essential here.

LEMMA 2.8. *Let U be a point and X be a maximal strong subspace. If $U \in X$, then*

$$(19) \quad \Lambda_{\Upsilon_\emptyset}(L_U(X)) = \{L \in \mathcal{L} : U \in L\}.$$

PROOF. The left-to-right inclusion is immediate by 2.7. To show the right-to-left inclusion let L be a line through U . By (10) there is a maximal strong subspace Y of the same type as X which contains L and by (15) it is not a punctured projective space. Then $L \in L_U(Y)$. Again by 2.7 we get $\Upsilon_\emptyset(L_U(X), L_U(Y))$ which makes the proof complete. $\square$

In fact 2.8 says that $\Lambda_{\Upsilon_\emptyset}(L_U(X))$ is the bundle of all lines through U . We can partition the line set of $\mathfrak{M}$ by $\Upsilon_\emptyset$, so that the equivalence classes will be the points of $\mathfrak{M}$. Note that points $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_t$ are collinear iff $\Lambda_{\Upsilon_\emptyset}(L_{U_1}(X)) \cap \Lambda_{\Upsilon_\emptyset}(L_{U_2}(X)) \cap \dots \cap \Lambda_{\Upsilon_\emptyset}(L_{U_t}(X)) \neq \emptyset$. This suffices to state the following theorem.

THEOREM 2.9. *Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be a spine space satisfying (10) and (15), and let $\mathcal{L}$ be its line set. Then $\mathfrak{M}$ and the structure of its lines together with coplanarity relation $\langle \mathcal{L}, \pi \rangle$ are definitionally equivalent.*

References

- [1] BLUNCK, A., HAVLICEK, H., *Affine spaces within projective spaces*, Results Math. **36** (1999), 237–251.
- [2] COHEN, H. *Point-line spaces related to buildings*. In *Handbook of incidence geometry*, F. Buekenhout, Ed. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1995, pp. 647–737.

- [3] KARZEL, H., MEISSNER, H., *Geschlitze inzidenzgruppen und normale fastmoduln*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamb., **31** (1967), 69–88.
- [4] KARZEL, H., PIEPER, I., *Bericht über geschlitzte inzidenzgruppen*, Jber. Deutsh. Math.-Verein. **70** (1970), 70–114.
- [5] PANKOV M., *Grassmannians of classical buildings*, Algebra and Discrete Mathematics Vol. 2, World Scientific, New Jersey, 2010.
- [6] PANKOV, M., PRAŻMOWSKI, K., AND ŻYNEL, M. *Geometry of polar Grassmann spaces*, Demonstratio Math. **39** (2006), 625–637.
- [7] PETELCZYC, K., AND ŻYNEL, M. *Coplanarity of lines in projective and polar Grassmann spaces*, Aequationes Math. (2015), DOI : 10.1007/s00010-015-0387-6
- [8] PRAŻMOWSKI, K., *On a construction of affine Grassmannians and spine spaces*, J. Geom. **72** (2001), 172–187.
- [9] PRAŻMOWSKI, K., ŻYNEL, M., *Affine geometry of spine spaces*, Demonstratio Math. **36** (2003), no. 4, 957–969.
- [10] PRAŻMOWSKI, K., ŻYNEL, M., *Automorphisms of spine spaces*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamb. **72** (2002), 59–77.
- [11] PRAŻMOWSKI, K., ŻYNEL, M., *Extended parallelity in spine spaces and its geometry*, J. Geom. **85** (2006), no. 1-2, 110–137.
- [12] PRAŻMOWSKI, K., ŻYNEL, M., *Geometry of the structure of linear complements*, J. Geom. **79** (2004), no. 1-2, 177–189.
- [13] ŻYNEL, M., *Complements of Grassmann substructures in projective Grassmannians*, Aequationes Math. **88** (2014), no. 1-2, 81–96.

K. Petelczyc, M. Żynel

Institute of Mathematics, University of Białystok,

K. Ciołkowskiego 1M, 15-245 Białystok, Poland

kryzpet@math.uwb.edu.pl, mariusz@math.uwb.edu.pl